

Nobody can blame U.S. companies for wanting to launch satellites at reasonable prices. On the other hand, I'm sure United States companies have some degree of concern about the explosions which have hampered the Chinese Long March program. Aside from these factors, the Clinton administration seems to discount the fact that the United States is uniquely positioned to be a leader in the low Earth orbit market.

On the central coast of California we are building the first polar orbit commercial spaceport in America. The spaceport expects to open its doors in 1996 and will provide a unique service—the ability to launch in polar orbit and launch for less money. It is the goal of the California spaceport to the one of the world's primary facilities for moving surface infrastructure into space. In addition, the California spaceport intends to do it safely, efficiently, and for less money—roughly \$5,000 per pound as opposed to the current scale of \$10,000 per pound.

As I mentioned a few weeks ago, I will soon be introducing national spaceport legislation. My intent is to create an environment that allows the U.S. commercial space industry to evolve, mature, and flourish.

□ 1500

This is an industry that is already on the move in California, but it is much more than just California. The United States has many potential launch bases—including Alaska and Hawaii—plus the two existing ones in California and Florida. The question we must ask is, with existing spaceport facilities—plus all of the potential launch bases—and a healthy market for boosters and satellites, why isn't the United States in a better position to compete with our international competitors for a bigger share of the commercial launch market?

The administration, by continuing to parcel out this market, is not only putting the United States at a competitive disadvantage, it is taking jobs away from Americans and it is discouraging what could be a hugely successful market for the country.

Mr. Speaker, I'm frankly a little puzzled by the administration's entire approach to the trade with the Chinese. As a Presidential candidate, Bill Clinton stated that as President, he would not renew most-favored-nation [MFN] trading status. Typically, the President changed his mind and opted for a policy of engagement.

A few weeks ago the Clinton administration announced its intention to impose a billion dollars' worth of punitive tariffs on Chinese imports over intellectual property rights. And just yesterday, while the No. 2 official from U.S. trade representative's office was in China negotiating copyrights, Energy Secretary O'Leary was there announcing \$6 billion in energy deals.

Hovering over this is the enormous trade deficit with the Chinese. When the figures were announced last week, Ambassador Kantor tried to paint a positive picture of this

deficit—a picture that Democrat Senator DORGAN of North Dakota described as: "the most bizarre interpretation that I have ever heard" of bad economic news.

Our trade policy with the Chinese seems to be going in several different directions. I would respectfully submit that the administration rethink the commercial launch agreement, particularly as it relates to low Earth orbit satellite launches. If the Clinton administration is interested in contributing to the success of a commercial space market, perhaps they would consider doing it in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask for the Clinton administration to take a look at this and support the American commercial space industry.

TO BE OR NOT TO BE CIVILIZED: THAT IS THE QUESTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BATEMAN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I rise today in support of continued Federal funding for the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Institute for Museum Services and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. To be or not to be civilized; that is the question, Mr. Speaker.

A civilized society must include art and cultural enrichment, and it is one of the responsibilities of government to support that aspect of our civilization. We get what we pay for. We cannot rely solely on the good will of a relatively few private individuals to fund the arts—it is the duty of us all.

This Nation's investment in the arts is one of the best we make. For example, the approximately \$2 million in Federal funding for the NEA, NEH, and IMS that goes to my county in California, San Diego County, is matched by nearly four times that amount in local contributions. This is a perfect example of public-private partnership. The Government's funding stimulates local giving to the arts which in turn stimulates local economies.

According to a recent study commissioned by the California Arts Council, nonprofit art organizations contribute some \$2.1 billion annually to California's economy, generate \$77 million in tax revenue, and create some 100,000 jobs. Yes, the arts are important to the State economy of California, and to other States as well. Business Week says that Americans spent \$340 billion on entertainment in 1993.

Critics tell us that the arts are only for the elite. Nothing could be further from the truth. Audiences and participants alike are people from all walks of life. Nearly 40 million tickets were sold last year to theater, music, and dance performances. Nielsen-rating figures show that 56.5 percent of households watching PBS programs earn less than \$40,000 a year. And a USA Today/CNN/Gallup poll showed that 76 percent of respondents thought the Government

should continue to fund public broadcasting. Exposure to the arts is especially important for our children. If our young people can be motivated, thrilled, enriched, and "turned on" by exciting experiences in theater, painting, pottery, or dance, they will be less likely to "turn on" to drugs or gangs to fill their empty hours and empty souls.

Barbra Streisand, in a speech at Harvard University earlier this month, told how participation in the choral club at her Brooklyn high school was the beginning of her career—and she urges more support for the arts, not less. She asks how we can accept a country which has no orchestras, choruses, libraries, or art classes to nourish our children. How many more talents like Barbra Streisand's are out there, whom we will lose when there are no programs to challenge them?

In San Diego County, the San Diego Opera Company and the San Diego Symphony provide opportunities for kids to attend the opera and symphony concerts. The opera regularly goes out to schools with ensemble performances.

San Diego's recipients of arts funding range from elementary schools and universities to KPBS public radio and TV to the Samahan Philippine Dance Company and the Centro Cultural de la Raza to the Balboa Park Museums and the Old Globe Theater, groups representing the entire population of San Diego County.

TheatreForum, and international theater magazine published at UCSD; the renowned La Jolla Playhouse whose productions go on to thrill audiences on Broadway and in the rest of the country; an international festival at locations on both sides of the border between San Diego and Tijuana, Mexico; graduate internships at the Museum of Photographic Arts; touring exhibitions from the Museum of Contemporary Arts in San Diego. I could go on and on. These and hundreds of other art forms are advanced by arts funding in San Diego County.

Even so, among all First World nations, the United States now spends the least on Federal arts support per citizen—and we are thinking of reneging on that support. If we say no to culture, we will prove, in the words of Los Angeles Philharmonic managing director Ernest Fleischmann, that "we are the dumbest Nation on the planet."

According to the General Accounting Office, the Department of Defense plans to spend \$9 billion over the next 7 years building nuclear attack submarines that the Pentagon admits it does not need. That \$9 billion could sustain the Arts and Humanities endowments at current levels for 26 years. 26 years of National Public Radio, Big Bird, music and art for kids—or superfluous subs for the Pentagon. Is this a difficult choice?

If we defund the NEA, the NEH, the IMS and PBS, we will be telling the world that we no longer take pride in

our theaters, our educational children's programs, our museums, our dance companies, our poets, ourselves.

Ultimately, we are judged by the heritage we leave our children. I hope we leave them more than soap operas and talk shows, attack submarines and assault rifles, gangs and drugs!

Yes, Mr. Speaker, to be or not to be civilized; that is the question.

LET US NOT BEGIN A WAR ON THE POOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FRANKS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, affirmative action affects mostly African-Americans.

Welfare? Almost half of the recipients are African-Americans.

Forty-six percent of black children are deemed poor, thus a number of food programs are more frequently used by African-Americans.

Most of the people in public housing are African-Americans.

As we continue to address these issues, the question is, Mr. Speaker, are we, as a Congress, looking at constructive changes or merely attacks toward African-Americans and the poor? Sadly, Mr. Speaker, at this point I am not quite sure.

It should be noted that to change human behavior one would use sticks and carrots, rewards and punishments. Using sticks only to alter behavior would cause one to earn the mean-spirited label.

Let us remember that we help our Nation by strengthening our weakest link, not by crushing it. Being compassionate toward the less fortunate is not a liberal or a conservative concept.

The Democrat-led War on Poverty was a failure back during the 1960's. Let us not begin a war on the poor.

THE RICKY RAY HEMOPHILIA RELIEF FUND ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I and 21 of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle took the first concrete steps toward righting a terrible wrong, by introducing the Ricky Ray Hemophilia Relief Fund Act of 1995. This bill addresses the suffering of approximately 8,000 people with hemophilia-associated AIDS and their families. The premise behind this legislation is simple: The Federal Government must assume partial responsibility for what happened to these people because it failed to respond to the warning signs that blood products sold in this country were contaminated with the deadly virus that causes AIDS. It's time for accountability. The facts of this tragedy are horrifying. During the years 1980 through 1987, despite medical ad-

vances that could have wiped out contaminants of blood products sold to hemophilia suffers, contaminated products continued to flood the marketplace and approximately 8,000 people with blood-clotting disorders became infected with HIV. Among the victims was a young Florida boy named Ricky Ray. He and his two brothers suffered from the hereditary blood-clotting disease known as hemophilia, an illness that makes people vulnerable to potentially life-threatening bleeding episodes. The brothers Ray—and thousands of people like them—hailed blood-clotting products known as factor as a tremendous medical breakthrough that would change their lives forever. But there was a dark side to this new wonder treatment—and that was the transmission of dangerous blood-borne viruses, such as hepatitis and eventually HIV. As a result, all of the Ray brothers became HIV-positive—and in December 1992 Ricky—the eldest of the three—died of AIDS at the age of 15. Before his death, Ricky courageously spoke out and became a national symbol of this terrible situation. He inspired many of his peers to tell their stories and begin seeking answers from the Federal Government and the blood industry. I am saddened that he did not live to see the day when legislation would be introduced in his honor, but we know his brothers, his sister, his parents, and the extended family of friends he established around the country, all recognize the enormous contribution he made in his very short life. The Ricky Ray Hemophilia Relief Fund Act establishes a fund of \$1 billion from which victims of this tragedy could collect \$125,000 each. The fund sunsets after 5 years and eligibility for its benefits are carefully defined in the bill. This legislation is not about charity—and it is not about making everything all right for the victims. Certainly \$125,000 is only a very small down payment on the staggering emotional and financial costs that hemophilia-associated AIDS places on its victims and their families. What this bill is about is the Federal Government owning up to a share of responsibility for what happened.

In 17 other developed countries where similar disasters occurred, national governments have stepped up to their obligations and established compensation programs. It's time for the United States to follow that lead. As this legislation moves through the process of consideration in this House, we will debate the extent of Government's obligation and the proper response to this tragedy. I know many of my colleagues are concerned about setting precedents and spending money. I share that concern—but I believe this is one of the things Government should appropriately be doing, responding to a tragedy that the Government had some responsibility to prevent. Of course, we look forward to the upcoming release of a thorough study conducted by the National Academy of Science's Insti-

tute of Medicine about what went wrong with the blood supply and how decisions about addressing those problems were made. Our legislation is in no way meant to prejudice or preclude that study, whose results should be available in May, nor do we have any interest in interfering with an ongoing legal process involving citizens and private industry. By presenting this bill to the House, we are simply acknowledging our commitment to the victims of this tragedy and our interest in seeing the Federal Government take action. I urge my colleagues to join us in this effort.

□ 1510

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 2 AND HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 24

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 2 and House Joint Resolution 24.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BATEMAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

COMMEMORATING BLACK HISTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BATEMAN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. TUCKER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity today, as we commemorate Black History Month, to thank some people. I want to thank them for their contribution to making America the great country that it is.

Now I won't get to them all today, and even if my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus stood here and helped me name them, we couldn't thank them all today, and even if all the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, whose very lives have been affected by them, were here today to thank them, we couldn't thank them all. But I will, however, try to thank as many of them as possible.

First, I want to thank God, for mother Earth and the fruit of her African body.

I want to thank Crispus Attucks, who at the Boston Massacre in 1770, became the first man to die in the American Revolution. I want to thank him for his desire for freedom and his fight for American independence.

I want to thank Frederick Douglass, the great abolitionist who spoke passionately against slavery, for always knowing and speaking with a clear voice. That he was equal to any man, even when the reality seemed to be otherwise.

I want to thank Matilda Arabella Evans, who in 1872 became the first African-American woman to practice